

**REMARKS**

The Office Action mailed January 8, 2008 has been reviewed and carefully considered and entry of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Reconsideration of the above-identified application, as amended and in view of the following remarks, is respectfully requested

Claims 1-19 are pending.

Claims 1-4 stand rejected.

Claims 5-10 are objected to.

Claims 11-19 are allowed.

The Specification is objected to failing to contain header information.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the objection to the specification as applicant respectfully submits that 37 CFR §1.77(b) discloses a *suggested* format for the arrangement of the disclosure. Applicant respectfully submits that the present disclosure follows the suggested format where applicable. With regard to 37 CFR§1.77(c), which was not cited in the Office Action, Applicant respectfully submits that section headings are suggested but not required, as 37 CFR §1.77(c) clearly states the sections defined in paragraphs (b) (1) through (b) (11) “should” be preceded by a section heading.

For at least this reason, applicant respectfully declines to amend the disclosure to include the suggested headings at this time.

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Abrams (USPPA 2003/0129353).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with and explicitly traverses the reason for rejecting the claims.

Claim 1 recites a display fabric (10) comprising a fabric layer (14) having at least one conductive layer (12) for passing an electrostatic field, and a plurality of furs (16) that are responsive to the electrostatic field to vertically extend out of the fabric layer (14).

Abrams discloses a patterned flock or pile wherein the flock material is permanently positioned in a vertical orientation. Abrams fails to disclose a conductive

layer of the fabric that passes an electrostatic field to which the flock material is responsive.

In rejecting the claims, the Office Action refers to paragraphs [0016] and [0017] for teaching the elements recited in claim 1. However a reading of these sections reveals that Abrams discloses a method of manufacture of the disclosed flock material by using an electrostatic field to distribute and orient the flock materials in a rubber layer (27).

More specifically, Abrams discloses the flock fibers are dispensed from a rotating brush 22 down into an electrostatic field and through barrier 29. The barrier 29 is referred to as the image screen. Abrams discloses that the rotating brush provides a charge to the flock fibers which are attracted to or repelled by the image screen 29. Those fibers that are attracted to the image screen pass through the screen and attach to adhesive 24 below the screen. ("Fibers 8 are propelled by electrostatic counter potential attraction toward the grounded electrode ... and are ... propelled into the adhesive 24 ...").

The fibers are thus vertically lodged permanently in the adhesive eventually forming the flock coating on an adhesive coated **rubber substrate material**.

Accordingly, the sections referred to by the Office Action teach an electrostatic method of forming permanently vertical fibers in a rubber substrate.

Hence, Abrams fails to disclose a conductive layer upon which the fibers are located or that the fibers are responsive to an electrostatic field in the conductive layer, as is recited in the claims.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element recited therein is expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference.

Abrams cannot be said to anticipate the subject matter recited in the claims as Abrams fails to expressly or inherently describe each and every element recited in the independent claims.

With regard to the remaining claims, these claims ultimately depend from independent claim 1, and, thus, the remaining dependent claims are also allowable by virtue of their dependence from an allowable base claim, without arguing the merits of each claim individually.

With regard to the objection of claims 5-10 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter if rewritten in independent form. However, applicant respectfully submits that these claims ultimately depend from independent claim 1, and, thus are also allowable by virtue of their dependence from an allowable base claim.

With regard to claims 11-19, these claims have been indicated to be allowable.

For all the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all the present claims are in allowable form and the issuance of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

In the event the Examiner deems personal contact desirable in the disposition of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone given below.

No fees are believed necessary for the timely filing of this paper.

Respectfully submitted,

Dan Piotrowski  
Registration No. 42,079



By: Carl A. Giordano  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 41, 780

Date: March 14, 2008

**Mail all correspondence to:**  
Dan Piotrowski, Registration No. 42,079  
US PHILIPS CORPORATION  
P.O. Box 3001  
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001  
Phone: (914) 333-9624  
Fax: (914) 332-0615